



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 6, 2019

No. 40

## Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God our shield, the giver of victory and honor, shine on us with Your kindness that brings a rich harvest of joy.

Today, guide our lawmakers with Your spirit and lead them by the power of Your prevailing Providence. May they trust You completely and permit You to remove obstacles from the road ahead.

Lord, train them in Your school of humility so they will walk safely and never stumble. Help them to remember that all efforts to defend themselves will fail without Your grace and mercy. May they not trust in their own strength and ingenuity but instead lean on You the God of might and miracles.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Chad A. Readler, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, yesterday, I came to the floor to speak about the Green New Deal. I compared it to the New Deal of the 1930s.

I mentioned before that the New Deal of the 1930s is not something that we ought to be emulating.

The National Recovery Administration of the 1930s was a key feature of that New Deal. It was designed to eliminate competition, with industry, government, and labor all working together.

The National Recovery Administration turned out hundreds of codes, regulating every aspect of business. Small businesses struggled to comply, job creation stalled, and prices stayed high.

When big business and big government get together to write regulations, hard-working Americans suffer. You don't create jobs.

So I hope you will take a look at how complicated the Green New Deal is, besides costing \$93 trillion in the future.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

### JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senate confirmed one of President Trump's well-qualified nominees to the Federal bench and advanced the nomination of another.

That is what we will do today. With Allison Rushing's nomination confirmed, we will vote later today on the nomination of Chad Readler and then turn to consideration of Eric Murphy to join him on the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Mr. Murphy is a graduate of Miami University and the University of Chicago Law School and now serves as the State solicitor of Ohio. He has held two prestigious clerkships on our Federal courts, including for Justice Anthony Kennedy on the U.S. Supreme Court.

So I hope our colleagues will join me in advancing another wise choice for our Nation's judiciary.

### THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. President, on another matter, in recent months our Nation has watched the Democratic Party take a sharp and abrupt left turn toward socialism.

A flawed ideology that has been rejected time and again across the world is now driving the marquee policy proposals of the new House Democratic majority, and nothing encapsulates this as clearly as the huge, self-inflicted, national wound the Democrats are agitating for called the Green New Deal.

Let's review a few of the greatest hits in this particular proposal.

Democrats have decided that every building in America needs to be either overhauled or replaced altogether. They are putting homeowners and small business owners on alert. The all-

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

knowing central planners here in the Nation's capital are raring to remodel the entire country.

Up next: ending all fossil fuel and nuclear energy production. Forget about coal and all of the jobs it supports in my State of Kentucky and around the country. Forget about the oil and natural gas industry and all of those jobs as well. The list goes on.

Oh, by the way, forget about nuclear, too—proving that this proposal doesn't even pretend to be a serious effort to reduce carbon emissions. It is just a statement of what sounds trendy in New York and San Francisco.

Anyone seriously concerned about carbon would know that nuclear power generates a majority of America's carbon-free electricity. You would think the carbon police would be glad that from 1995 to 2016, American nuclear power met the emissions equivalent of keeping 3 billion cars off the road.

Let me say that again. You would think the carbon police would be glad that from 1995 to 2016, American nuclear power met the emissions equivalent of keeping 3 billion cars off the road.

Oh, but alas, these Democrats will not let facts get in the way of what is fashionable.

Besides, why should America bother being a net exporter of energy when we could leave all of that economic potential to competitors like China?

Naturally, as background documents explained, this means eliminating all combustion engines—cars, lawn mowers, commercial airliners. Everything must go. Everything must go.

By the way, that backgrounder really helps clarify another goal behind all of this. It is providing “economic security,” even those who are “unwilling to work.”

All of this and more can be ours for the low, low price of a staggering expansion of centralized government and—wait for it—upward of a mere \$93 trillion. Ninety-three trillion is more than every dollar our Federal Government has spent in its entire history to date—combined. It is more than the combined annual GDP of every nation on Earth.

As our colleague Senator BLUNT and the policy committee have pointed out, this amount of money could rebuild the entire Interstate Highway System every single year—just for the heck of it—for 250 years, and you would still have a little left over—a little left over.

Or maybe Americans would rather have something nicer to drive on the roads we already have. For the comparatively cheap price of just \$66 trillion, I am told the government could buy every American a Ferrari. What a great idea. For the comparatively cheap price of just \$66 trillion, the government could buy every American a Ferrari. But, of course, everyone would have to get their driving in before Democrats ban the internal combustion engine.

To be clear, \$93 trillion is just one number and one attempt to estimate the pricetag of this fantasy novel. The proposal is so lacking in details and math that it is almost impossible for analysts to even know where to begin trying to connect it to the real world.

Let's talk about where this money would come from. That is always a question worth asking.

If we spread that \$93 trillion out over 10 years and over every American household, we get about \$65,000 per household—\$65,000 every year for every household. The median income in this country is around \$60,000. So, like any good socialist plan, I am sure we would hear a lot about soaking the rich.

We always do. We would hear that wealthy Americans could pay for this whole thing, if only they were sufficiently civic-minded, but, of course, that is not even close to accurate. A huge share of the bill would land at the feet of the American middle class. There are not enough billionaires—there are not enough billionaires to pay the trillions needed for this massive government plan.

Even if Washington decided the IRS should grab every single cent of adjusted gross income above \$1 million, all of it taken, it would only bring in a little over one-tenth—one-tenth—of what the Green New Deal is estimated to cost every year. Take all the money away from the millionaires, it would only bring in a little over one-tenth of what the Green New Deal is estimated to cost every year.

In fact, in order to break even on this proposal alone, the Federal Government would have to take \$9 of every \$10 that every single American earns. The Federal Government would have to take \$9 out of \$10 of everything every American earns.

You had better believe that families' last dollar would need to go toward keeping the lights on. By one analysis, middle-class families could see their power bills jump by more than \$300 a month under the Green New Deal. That would take up the last dollar they had left.

I know Senator ERNST and several of our colleagues will be speaking at greater length on this issue later today, and I am sure each of them will point out that there certainly is one green thing about this sprawling proposal, one green thing: the huge, unprecedented pile of middle-class families' money that Democrats are itching—itching—to grab.

#### RESOLUTION CONDEMNING ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. President, on one final matter, I want to discuss something that will be happening on the floor of the House perhaps as soon as today.

Remarkably, for the second time in just the last 3 weeks, Speaker PELOSI apparently feels compelled to have her Members vote on a resolution that will reportedly condemn anti-Semitism—a resolution that will purportedly condemn anti-Semitism.

Unfortunately, again, for the second time in just the last 3 weeks, this

seems to be in response to the invocation of crude, hateful, and backward anti-Semitic stereotypes by one specific freshman member of the House Democratic majority.

This Democratic Congresswoman already stoked controversy in mid-February, having publicly proclaimed that Israel's supporters are only in it for the money. Apparently, she believes the only reason leaders would stand with the Jewish people and the State of Israel is Jewish money. Well, I think we have all heard that kind of talk before, and we must not tolerate it.

During my time in the Senate, I have had the honor of traveling all over America. I know I speak for colleagues on both sides of the aisle when I say that support for the State of Israel and the U.S.-Israel relationship is deeply felt—deeply felt—all across America. Our relationship is built on common values and democratic principles, our shared interests, close partnerships, and deep friendships. The support for Israel that you see in this Chamber is not the work of some shadow conspiracy. The Members of this body support Israel because so many Americans support Israel.

I had hoped this regrettable episode might have caused this lawmaker to be more careful with her language, but, alas, just a few weeks later, here we are again: more anti-Semitic tropes. This time, she claims that supporters of Israel actually have “an allegiance to a foreign country.” That is that old, ugly, dual loyalty smear, plain as day.

We should also not overlook that in a few cases, these anti-Semitic statements have provoked offensive, anti-Muslim comments in response. That is hateful and completely inexcusable as well.

So now the House of Representatives seeks to distance itself from this Member's remarks and will apparently soon vote to condemn anti-Semitism for the second time in just a few weeks. I hope this time the message is clear.

Support for Israel isn't about the “Benjamins,” it is about the hearts and minds of the American people. It is unconscionable for any Member of the U.S. Congress, even less a Member of the House Foreign Relations Committee, to repeatedly traffic in base stereotypes.

The long, bloody legacy of anti-Semitism is spread out over the pages of history, but, regrettably, this scourge is not confined to history.

Long common across the Middle East, violent, hateful acts of anti-Semitism have been increasing throughout Europe. Less than a lifetime after the Holocaust, 9 out of 10 European Jews say anti-Semitism has increased—increased—in the past 5 years.

Eighty-eight percent of French Jews say they actively worry about targeted vandalism. That country alone saw 541 anti-Semitic incidents in 2018, a massive 74-percent increase from just the prior year.